UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,441	03/04/2002	Gerald Burnett	CA1149	4401

23493	7590	12/05/2006

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
401 Castro Street, Ste 220
Mountain View, CA 94041-2007

EXAMINER
SCUDERI, PHILIP S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2153	

DATE MAILED: 12/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/018,441	BURNETT ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Philip S. Scuderi	2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>30 October 2006</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

PTOL-326 (Rev. 08-06)   Office Action Summary   Part of Paper No./Mail Date 20061114

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37

CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for

continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely

paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 30 October 2006 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's remarks have been considered but they are not fully persuasive. The examiner

has introduced new grounds of rejection, but will properly respond below to those arguments that

still apply to the new grounds of rejection.

1.   Applicant asserts that Stewart (US 6,389,112) does not teach a report generation system "in

Col. 14 lines 49-53." <u>Remarks</u> at 20.

At column 14, lines 49-53, Stewart discloses:

"[T]he operator of the accessing processor 34 may selectively review processed data on
either a switch or network basis by accessing the processed data through a reports and
graphs section 302 of the main page GUI."

If a system that generates a "reports and graphs section" at a user's request is not a "report

generation system" then the examiner does not know what is.

2.   Applicant asserts that Stewart's (US 6,389,112) voice network cannot support "two or more of audio, video, text, graphics, telepointers, annotations, etc." and therefore cannot be construed as a "multimedia" network. Remarks at 23.

The claimed network is "for at least audio and video communications" (emphasis added). The audio and video communications are claimed as mere intended use of the network. Moreover, even if the claims were interpreted such that the audio and video communications are required, the claims are still obvious over various references.

For example, Lindholm discloses "The present ADSL ... and HDSL ... techniques ... offer new possibilities for high-rate data and video transmission along the wire pair of a telephone network to the subscribers' terminals" (column 1, lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to enable Stewart's network to support such video transmission, thereby continently enabling users to conduct video communications.

As another example, McNamara (US 5,974,139) discloses "A recently pronounced standard in telecommunications defines an Asymmetrical Digital Subscriber Line (ADSL) system which executes a high speed transfer of data over a single twisted-wire pair, such as an existing telephone line. ... An ADSL system is ... more than capable of providing video-on-demand capability, video conferencing, data file transfer capability and can provide all of this capability simultaneously" (column 1, lines 29-46).

3.   Applicant asserts that Stewart (US 6,389,112) does not teach "external" network system events as recited by claim 1. Remarks at 24-25.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "monitoring events ... comprising ...external events consisting of events occurring outside the underlying multimedia collaboration system network" (lines 4-8).

Many of the events for which event information is logged are "events occurring outside the

underlying multimedia collaboration system network" as claimed. The multimedia collaboration

system network corresponds to IXC network 10 shown by Stewart in figure 1. Stewart's system logs

event information for various events that are not limited to occurring within IXC network 10, such

as file downloads (table 1). File downloads are particularly exemplarily because Stewart discloses

that "log data would be downloaded to the central data processing unit 24 from the switch 12e"

(column 9, lines 57-59) and figure 1 clearly shows that central data processing unit 24 is external to

IXC network 10. So such a file download is an external event as claimed.

Applicant's remaining arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection or refer

to assertions that the examiner has responded to above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject
matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 31-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite

for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant

regards as the invention.

Claim 31 recites the limitation "the independent reporting system" in line 13. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 42 recites the limitation "the independent reporting system" in line 13. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness

rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-28, 30, 43-49, and 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious

over Stewart (US 6,389,112) in view of Lindholm (US 6,477,207).

Regarding claim 1, Stewart teaches a multimedia collaboration reporting system for use in

connection with at least one underlying multimedia collaboration system, the system comprising:

at least one event monitoring module for monitoring events associated with the underlying

multimedia collaboration system network, said events comprising: internal system events consisting

of events occurring with the underlying multimedia collaboration system network, external events

consisting of events occurring outside the underlying multimedia collaboration system network and

service events, consisting of service events associated with servers connected to said underlying

multimedia collaboration system network said at least one monitoring module responsively

generating corresponding event information (column 6, lines 34-44; table 1; see also the "Response

to Arguments" section, #3);

at least one database module (network processor 28) for receiving event information and

recording the event information therein and for searching for and retrieving event information

according to predetermined characteristics and attributes at one or more later times after said

recording (column 10, lines 36-41; column 12, lines 65-67); and

a reporting module for receiving query information from a user and for generating a report

in accordance with the query information using the event information recorded in the database

module (column 10, lines 36-41).

Stewart does not expressly disclose that the network supports at least audio and video

communications. The claimed network is "for at least audio and video communications" (emphasis

added). The audio and video communications are claimed as mere intended use of the network.

Also, even if the claims are interpreted such that the audio and video communications are required,

the claims are still obvious over Lindholm (US 6,477,207).

Lindholm discloses "The present ADSL ... and HDSL ... techniques ... offer new

possibilities for high-rate data and video transmission along the wire pair of a telephone network to

the subscribers' terminals" (column 1, lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to enable Stewart's

network to support such video transmission, thereby continently enabling users to conduct video

communications.

Regarding claim 2, Stewart teaches that the network reporting system is configured to

monitor events associated with a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks (because the

reporting system can be on a WAN), wherein one of the modules (e.g., the reporting module) is

deployed in a centralized manner with respect to one of the multimedia collaboration system

networks (figure 1; column 4, line 35 et seq.)

Regarding claim 3, Stewart teaches that the network reporting system is configured to

monitor events associated with a plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks (because the

reporting system can be on a WAN), wherein one of the modules (e.g., the reporting module) is

deployed in a centralized manner among the plurality of multimedia collaboration system networks

(figure 1; column 4, line 35 et seq.)

Regarding claim 4, Stewart teaches that the decentralization of any of the modules results in a first system architecture that parallels the network architecture of a selected one of the multimedia system networks (figure 1).

Regarding claim 5, Stewart teaches that the server events comprise service events (table 1).

Regarding claim 6, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises a startup record operable to store event information corresponding to the server startup events (table 1).

Regarding claim 7, Stewart teaches that the startup record comprises supplemental information (table 1).

Regarding claim 8, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises at least one shutdown record operable to store event information corresponding to server shutdown events (table 1).

Regarding claim 9, Stewart teaches that the shutdown record comprises supplemental information (table 1).

Regarding claim 10, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises at least one user login record operable to store event information corresponding to user login events (table 1).

Regarding claim 11, Stewart teaches that the user login record comprises supplemental information (table 1).

Regarding claim 12, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises a user logout record operable to store event information corresponding to user logout events (table 1).

Regarding claim 13, Stewart teaches that the user logout record comprises supplemental information (table 1).

Regarding claim 14, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises at least one call record operable to store event information corresponding to call events (table 1).

Regarding claim 15, Stewart teaches that the call record comprises timing information (table 1).

Regarding claim 16, Stewart teaches that the database module comprises at least one call error record operable to store event information corresponding to call error events (table 1).

Regarding claim 17, Stewart teaches that the call error record comprises timing information (table 1).

Regarding claim 18, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises at least one service record operable to store event information corresponding to service events (table 1).

Regarding claim 19, Stewart teaches that the service record comprises timing information (table 1).

Regarding claim 20, Stewart teaches that the database module further comprises at least one service record operable to store event information corresponding to service error events (table 1).

Regarding claim 21, Stewart teaches that the service error record comprises timing information (table 1).

Regarding claim 22, Stewart teaches that the database module comprises a plurality of localized databases, each localized database configured to store the monitored event information associated with a particular multimedia collaboration system network, and a centralized database configured to centrally maintain the stored information associated with each of the plurality of localized databases (figure 1).

Regarding claim 23, Stewart teaches that the database module comprises a centrally located database configured to maintain the monitored event information (figure 1).

Regarding claim 24, Stewart teaches that the database module comprises a plurality of localized databases, each database configured to store the monitored event information associated with a particular multimedia collaboration system network (figure 1).

Regarding claim 25, Stewart teaches that the reporting module is configured to generate either standard or customizable reports relating to the operation of the multimedia collaboration network in response to the database query parameter information (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 26, Stewart teaches that the reporting module comprises a web-based interface for providing either of a web-based query or response interactivity to the reporting module such that a database query can be formulated and provided via the Internet (figure 1; column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 27, Stewart teaches that the reporting module is operable, in response to the query information, to perform either of predetermined calculations or conditional tests on the event information stored in the database module in order to generate a report (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 28, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a machine readable report file (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 30, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a combination of textual and graphical data (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 43, the claim is rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 44, the claim is rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 45, Stewart teaches that the database query system comprises a general filter (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 46, Stewart teaches that the report generation system is configured to generate either standard or customizable reports about the multimedia collaboration system network in response to the database query information (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 47, Stewart teaches that the reporting system provides a web-based interface for providing either of a web-based query or response interactivity such that a database query can be formulated and provided via the Internet (figure 1).

Regarding claim 48, Stewart teaches that the reporting system is operable, in response to the query information, to perform either of predetermined calculations or conditional tests on the event information stored in the database in order to generate a report (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 49, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a machine readable report file (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 51, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a combination of textual and graphical data (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 52, the claim is rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 1.

Regarding claim 53, Stewart teaches that said event information comprises event logs (table 1).

Claims 31-39, 41, and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 6,389,112) in view of Lindholm (US 6,477,207) and McNamara (US 5,974,139).

Regarding claim 31, Stewart teaches a multimedia collaboration system for conducting a conference among a plurality or participants and for exchanging at least audio and video transmission, comprising:

a multimedia collaboration system network for providing services to a plurality of

workstations (figure 1);

a data network providing a data path along which data can be shared among the plurality of

the workstations; and a data conference manager for managing the sharing of data between the

plurality of workstations (figure 1);

a separate reporting system connected with the multimedia collaboration system network

and configured to provide reporting analysis of the multimedia collaboration system network, the

reporting system comprising a network control system configured to monitor event information,

said event information comprising internal event information consisting of information regarding

events occurring within the system network, external event information consisting of information

regarding events occurring outside the system network, and service event information, consisting of

information regarding service events associated with servers of the system network, affecting the

multimedia collaboration system network (column 6, lines 34-44; table 1; see also the "Response to

Arguments" section, #3);

a database configured to store the monitored event information (figure 1);

a database query system configured to format a database query according to information and

to query the database in accordance with the database query information (column 10, lines 36-41;

column 12, lines 65-67); and

a report generation system configured to generate an analysis report from the monitored

event information stored in the database in accordance with the database query information (column

10, lines 36-41; column 12, lines 65-67).

Stewart does not expressly disclose that the network supports at least audio and video

communications. The claimed network is "for at least audio and video communications" (emphasis

added). The audio and video communications are claimed as mere intended use of the network.

Also, even if the claims are interpreted such that the audio and video communications are required,

the claims are still obvious over Lindholm (US 6,477,207).

Lindholm discloses "The present ADSL ... and HDSL ... techniques ... offer new

possibilities for high-rate data and video transmission along the wire pair of a telephone network to

the subscribers' terminals" (column 1, lines 40-49). It would have been obvious to enable Stewart's

network to support such video transmission, thereby continently enabling users to conduct video

communications.

Stewart does not expressly disclose a workstation, connected to the network, having a

monitor for displaying visual images and A/V capture and reproduction capabilities for capturing

and reproducing video images and spoken audio of participants. However, connecting such a

workstation to a telephone network was well known in the art, as evidenced by McNamara.

McNamara teaches an ADSL system that executes a high speed transfer over a telephone line and

provides the capability of video conferencing (column 1, lines 29-46). The claimed workstation

having a monitor is inherent in a video conferencing system. It would have been obvious to provide

such a workstation so that users could participate in video conferences.

Regarding claim 32, Stewart teaches that the database comprises a plurality of localized

databases, each database configured to store the monitored event information associated with a

particular multimedia collaboration system network, and a centralized database configured to

centrally maintain the stored information associated with each of the plurality of localized databases

(figure 1).

Regarding claim 33, Stewart teaches that the database comprises a centrally located database

configured to maintain the monitored event information (figure 1).

Regarding claim 34, Stewart teaches that the database comprises a plurality of localized databases, each localized database configured to stored the monitored event information associated with a particular multimedia collaboration system network (figure 1).

Regarding claim 35, Stewart teaches that the database query system comprises a general filter (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 36, Stewart teaches that the report generation system is configured to generate either standard or customizable reports about the multimedia collaboration system network in response to the database query information (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 37, Stewart teaches that the reporting system provides a web-based interface for providing either of a web-based query or response interactivity such that a database query can be formulated and provided via the Internet (figure 1).

Regarding claim 38, Stewart teaches that the reporting system is operable, in response to the query information, to perform either of predetermined calculations or conditional tests on the event information stored in the database in order to generate a report (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 39, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a machine readable report file (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 41, Stewart teaches that the report comprises a combination of textual and graphical data (column 10, lines 36-41).

Regarding claim 42, the claim is rejected for substantially the same reasons as claim 31.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 6,389,112) in view of Lindholm (US 6,477,207) and Ditmer (US 6,490,620).

Regarding claim 29, Stewart does not expressly show a comma separated report file. However, the CSV report format is a comma separated report format that was well known in the art, as evidenced by Ditmer (column 19, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to use such a report format because doing so would allow for the reports to be easily read by a variety of applications.

Claim 40 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart (US 6,389,112) in view of Lindholm (US 6,477,207), and McNamara (US 5,974,139), and further in view of Ditmer (US 6,490,620).

Regarding claim 40, Stewart does not expressly show a comma separated report file. However, the CSV report format is a comma separated report format that was well known in the art, as evidenced by Ditmer (column 19, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to use such a report format because doing so would allow for the reports to be easily read by a variety of applications.

Regarding claim 50, Stewart does not expressly show a comma separated report file. However, the CSV report format is a comma separated report format that was well known in the art, as evidenced by Ditmer (column 19, lines 35-43). It would have been obvious to use such a report format because doing so would allow for the reports to be easily read by a variety of applications.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Philip S. Scuderi whose telephone number is (571) 272-5865. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00 am - 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PS

GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100